

City of Tucson Department of Urban Planning and Design  
U of A Pilot Area & Draft NPZ Ordinance

**SUMMARY OF JUNE 14, 2007 MEETING WITH STAKEHOLDERS**

IT Building - 481 W. Paseo Redondo 5 - 7 PM

**Present:**

Jan Aalberts, Moderator - Sky House

**Committee Members**

Colette Altaffer	Ruth Beeker	Rick Bright
Joan Calcagno	Randi Dorman	Linda Drew
Mike Goodman	Mac Hudson	Jose Luis Ibarra
Diana Lett	Phil Lipman	Dyer Lytle
Tom Mueller (absent)	Alice Roe (absent)	Mary Beth Savel
Richard Studwell	Gail Schuessler	Mike Teufel (absent)
Jon Wilt	Gal Witmer	Steve Brigham
Sarah Evans	JT Fey (absent)	Corky Poster (absent)

**Audience Members/Alternates**

Dan Anglin	Monika Ashe	Ted Cooper
Bill Dupont	Diana Hadley	Karolyn Kendrick
Holly Lachowicz	John O'Dowd	Bonnie Poulos
Marilyn Robinson	Bob Schlanger	

**City Staff**

Jim Mazzocco - UPD	Adam Smith - UPD	Aline Torres - UPD
Michael McCrory - City Attorney		

Jan Aalberts asked that the committee members, staff and members of the audience introduce themselves and state their association. Jan reiterated the objective and purpose of the committee - to come to a consensus on clear recommendations for staff to bring to the Mayor and Council for the pilot overlay and the NPZ draft. Jan reviewed the meeting rules and the "Facts of Life" as revised based on the discussions at the June 7, 2007 meeting. Jan explained that, at the direction of the Council members, the meetings would be open to public. Audience members are welcome to observe, make comments and suggestions during those times described as "call to the audience" on each meeting's agenda. A time limit of 2 minutes will be allowed for each member to speak.

At the initial call to the audience, it was requested that the time allotted at the beginning of the meeting be added to the 10 minutes allowed at the end of the meeting. The general feeling was that there wasn't anything to comment about at the beginning of the meeting and the audience would prefer to have an opportunity to speak at the end of the meeting. After

a short discussion, it was agreed that a 15-minute block of time would be set aside at the end of the meeting for the audience members to comment.

A member of the audience requested that the Tucson Association of Realtors have representation on the committee.

Jan and members of City staff reviewed the information provided in the meeting packets. Specific requests for information were addressed. These included the following:

- Parking regulations for R-1, R-2, R-3
- Clarification of apartment, house, minidorm, what differentiates these?
- Definition of densities
- General Plan Policies for infill development and neighborhood preservation
- U of A projected population and information regarding UMC expansion plans
- Comparison of ASU and UofA policies for provision of on-campus student housing
- Status of the MS&R, traffic patterns, traffic volumes on arterials, local streets
- Major Streets and Routes Plan
- Status of the fixed rail route

Representatives from the UofA and UMC provided documents addressing UofA enrollment and housing information, information regarding the UMC concept development plan and the University of Arizona Fact Book 2006-07.

Concern about the stated/listed committee member organization representation was raised. Jim Mazzocco explained that staff made every effort to select members for the committee that would include a balance of interests for discussion of the issues related to the pilot overlay and the draft NPZ ordinance. Jim stated that anyone interested in attending the pilot overlay and draft NPZ discussions is welcome to do so. As a member of the audience, they will be given a chance to speak and voice their opinion. Anyone wishing to be notified of upcoming meetings, receive meeting notes, agendas or other information should contact Aline Torres at UPD so that they can be added to the list of contacts. Jim also reminded the members of the committee and the audience that the job of the committee is to consider the interests of all the people that may be affected by the pilot overlay and the draft ordinance.

The group then discussed the suggestion for a two-tier process for the pilot overlay. Opinion on this issue included the following:

- The belief that the committee should concentrate on general overlay issues;
- The neighborhood representatives are attending these discussions to determine what issues can be addressed in more specific terms in the "subareas";

- The possibility that there should not be an overlay at all;
- An explanation by an audience member/neighborhood representative that the Neighborhood Preservation Plan (NPP) that is part of the draft NPZ ordinance will address the specific neighborhood concerns as part of the NPZ.

Staff stressed that Mayor and Council direction requires presentation of a status report on the discussions of the UofA environs pilot overlay on July 10, 2007. The discussions will result in the formulation of a recommendation to the Mayor and Council on August 10, 2007.

Key questions posed by the committee included the following:

- What are the problems that are part of the pilot area?
- Are minidorms the issue that is really "driving" this?
- Is solving the minidorm issue all that needs to be done to reduce the problem?
- What is appropriate for development in the UofA area in light of the needs of the entire area - NPZ, pilot area?

The majority of the committee members support the two-tier system citing the belief that problems in the specific areas should be addressed first. The first tier is considered a stopgap measure only and doesn't address the real problems neighborhoods are facing. Neighborhoods are losing their identity as older buildings are being demolished and being replaced by housing that is not considered traditional for the neighborhood.

In an effort to reinforce the understanding of consensus as it relates to the recommendation the committee will bring to staff, Jan stated that consensus means that the group is supporting the recommendation that staff will bring to the Mayor and Council. If no consensus can be reached, a vote will be taken and the Mayor and Council will be informed of the vote. The committee may not agree completely with everything, but the recommendation will be something that everyone in the group can live with. A member of the committee clarified that the Mayor and Council may choose to modify or disregard staff's recommendation and make a different decision than what is discussed in these meetings.

During the discussion of the key questions, a member of the committee stated that the questions appeared to be "loaded" questions. Concerns relating to the location of student housing considering economically feasible densities, what expectations a resident of the neighborhoods in the UofA environs should have in terms of students living in the neighborhood. Another committee member stated that neighborhoods are harmed when

student-housing units are introduced into established neighborhoods. A discussion ensued related to staff and faculty wanting to live near the UofA and the desire of these established neighborhoods wanting to remain owner-occupied and regain owner-occupation of residential properties. Neighborhood representatives believe that neighborhoods are being required to sacrifice their desired lifestyle to "solve" the housing shortage at the UofA. Neighborhoods are suffering degradation when large numbers of students move into their neighborhoods. Quality of life issues related to bad behavior of students, on-street parking, parking in the front yards of properties, interference with trash collection and mail delivery were mentioned. A neighborhood representative disagreed with the statement that nuisance issues are separate from zoning issues and cannot be enforced using zoning regulations. A number of committee members agreed that undergraduates should reside in supervised housing situations, however a UofA representative stated that the State cannot mandate that the UofA provide housing for students. The group agreed that neighborhoods should be preserved along with providing housing for students. Neighborhoods in the UofA environs tend to be unstable environments and staff and faculty want to live in areas that are predictable and stable. Staff and faculty at the UofA want to live in traditional neighborhoods in single-family detached homes. Regardless of where and under what circumstances the students live, housing for 28,000 students needs to be provided.

There are appropriate locations for student housing in high-rise, high-density structures along major transportation corridors. The extension of the streetcar route will provide excellent opportunities for new development and redevelopment of properties in those areas. When students live in a guesthouse on a property or in smaller numbers in a single-family residence, problems with assimilation usually don't occur. Conversely, when high concentrations of students live together in unsupervised situations, that assimilation is more difficult. A question was raised about imposing stricter penalties for "red tagging" A committee member stated concern that students were being generalized as "bad" elements, undesirables and as criminals. Members of the committee felt that limiting the locations of student housing units would force those uses to move to the edge of the City and therefore just relocate the problem. A suggestion was made that the UofA should buy existing apartment buildings/complexes, use them as student housing and provide supervision.

A discussion of what the NPZ will be able to accomplish and what an overlay would provide were discussed. Questions regarding a time limit or "sunset rule" were asked. Staff responded saying the Mayor and Council could revisit the progress of the ordinance after a year and make a decision at that time to continue to use the ordinance, modify requirements or abandon it. Members of the committee feel that incentives should be provided to builders to develop properties using "Smart Growth" and "Green Building" principles.

A committee member provided an analogy of product testing before public consumption of merchandise as a way of illustrating how the pilot overlay might be able to provide valuable information as to how well it would work. Another committee member suggested that there

should be two separate Land Use or Zoning Codes - one for the neighborhoods included in the overlay environs and another one for the rest of the City. When residents add on to or expand their homes, guidelines in that particular overlay area may have far reaching affects that are not anticipated. Concern was mentioned regarding older homes located on the edges of neighborhoods that are zoned R-2 or R-3 that are being demolished and then redeveloped with higher density residential uses. Infill development is not intended to increase densities everywhere in the City. Infill development should provide high-density development along transportation corridors. Appropriate development should be located in all neighborhoods, not just in the UofA area.

The committee discussed reducing the size of the pilot area to only those neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the University, however, other neighborhood representatives felt that the affects of actions taken in the UofA environs would reach their neighborhoods also. There are student housing developments in the Starr Pass area that have shuttle services to the UofA and when the Christopher City development was still in existence, students lived north of the University with little or no affect on other City residents. A committee member stated that a ghetto of minidorms is being created in certain areas of the City and as a result a withdrawal of services is occurring in these areas. The citizens of Tucson should be taken into consideration when development is proposed - not just economic considerations. We need to recognize that housing is an industry and there is economic value in providing and owning housing. Other members of the community need to be included as part of the decision-making process - students, members of the Chamber of Commerce, realtors.

## Challenges identified (6/14/07)

### Category - Neighborhood Character

- Preserving neighborhoods while providing housing for students.
- Neighborhoods are losing their identity as older buildings are being demolished and being replaced by housing that is not considered traditional for the neighborhood.
- Concerns relating to the location of student housing considering economically feasible densities
- What expectations a resident of the neighborhoods in the U of A environs should have in terms of students living in the neighborhood.
- Neighborhoods are harmed when student-housing units are introduced into established neighborhoods.
- Staff and faculty wanting to live near the U of A.
- Established neighborhoods wanting to remain owner-occupied and regain owner-occupation of residential properties.
- Neighborhood representatives believe that neighborhoods are being required to sacrifice their desired lifestyle to "solve" the housing shortage at the U of A.
- Neighborhoods are suffering degradation when large numbers of students move into their neighborhoods.
- Quality of life issues related to bad behavior of students, on-street parking, parking in the front yards of properties, interference with trash collection and mail delivery were mentioned.
- Nuisance issues versus zoning issues.
- Student housing supervision.
- The state cannot mandate that the U of A provide housing for students.
- Neighborhoods in the U of A environs tend to be unstable environments and staff and faculty want to live in areas that are predictable and stable.
- Staff and faculty at the U of A want to live in traditional neighborhoods in single-family detached homes.
- Regardless of where and under what circumstances the students live, housing for 28,000 students needs to be provided.
- When students live in a guesthouse on a property or in smaller numbers in a single-family residence, problems with assimilation usually don't occur. Conversely, when high concentrations of students live together in unsupervised situations, that assimilation is more difficult.
- A question was raised about imposing stricter penalties for "red tagging"
- A committee member stated concern that students were being generalized as "bad" elements, undesirables and as criminals.
- Members of the committee felt that limiting the locations of student housing units would force those uses to move to the edge of the City and therefore just relocate the problem.
- When residents add on to or expand their homes, guidelines in that particular overlay area may have far reaching affects that are not anticipated.
- Concern was mentioned regarding older homes located on the edges of neighborhoods that are zoned R-2 or R-3 that are being demolished and then redeveloped with higher density residential uses. Infill development is not intended to increase densities everywhere in the City.
- The committee discussed reducing the size of the pilot area to only those neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the University; however, other neighborhood representatives felt that the affects of actions taken in the U of A environs would reach their neighborhoods also.

- A ghetto of mini-dorms is being created in certain areas of the City and as a result a withdrawal of services is occurring in these areas.
- We need to recognize that housing is an industry and there is economic value in providing and owning housing.

Suggestions/Ideas (6/14/07):

- Members of the committee feel that incentives should be provided to builders to develop properties using "Smart" and "Green" Building principles.
- The pilot overlay as a true "pilot", subject to review in a fixed time period.
- Two separate Land Use or Zoning Codes – one for the neighborhoods included in the overlay environs and another one for the rest of the City.
- Infill development should provide high-density development along transportation corridors. Appropriate development should be located in all neighborhoods, not just in the U of A area.
- There are student housing developments in the Starr Pass area that have shuttle services to the U of A and when the Christopher City development was still in existence, students lived north of the University with little or no affect on other City residents.
- There are appropriate locations for student housing in high-rise, high-density structures along major transportation corridors.
- The extension of the streetcar route will provide excellent opportunities for new development and redevelopment of properties in those areas.

# Flip Chart Notes

## UofA Pilot Area - 6/14/07

Challenges - Where should student housing be located in an economically feasible density?

Assumption - the group is OK with infill development

-----

UofA obligation to provide housing is inadequate

28,000 UofA students need housing, UMC needs housing

We are asking the Land Use Code to manage behavior

UofA staff and faculty want to live in traditional neighborhoods

The amount of ground it takes to fulfill student housing needs and how much it costs

Critical mass - where there is too much student density, parking

Promote good infill and prevent "bad" infill - do we need an overlay?

"Supervised" student housing, housing students in appropriate locations

Neighbors in these areas would like to change the direction of development

The people in the best position to change the direction are the development community

We need to preserve the neighborhoods, but we also need to provide housing for 28,000 students

Staff and faculty want to live in stable neighborhoods, neighborhoods with lots of students are not necessarily stable

What is the right kind of redevelopment and where should it be in the overlay zone?

The size of the proposed overlay is monstrous

Time limit? → end date for pilot area?

There is a recession in real estate now and housing is an industry

The City/UofA should enact a penalty for nuisance complaints ("red tags")

The committee wants to see the results of all the discussions before the document is sent out for "public consumption"

Test and retest, then adopt an ordinance, should there be separate Codes?

Will the potential rules hurt single family development?

Historic houses (old houses) are being torn down

Representatives should be present from student organizations, property management firms